

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RAYMOND W. LONDON, on behalf
of himself and others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NEW ALBERTSON'S, INC.;
CERBERUS CAPITAL
MANAGEMENT (CALIFORNIA),
LLC; and DOES 1 through 25,
inclusive

Defendants.

CASE NO. 08-CV-1173-H
(CAB)

ORDER CERTIFYING
CONSTITUTIONAL
CHALLENGE TO STATE
STATUTE IN ACCORDANCE
WITH 28 U.S.C. § 2403 AND
FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 5.1(b)

On July 2, 2008, defendants removed this action from San Diego Superior Court, asserting jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d)(2), 1453. (See Doc. Nos. 1-2.) On July 10, 2008, defendant New Albertson's, Inc. filed a motion to dismiss along with notice of a constitutional challenge to two California statutes, in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.1(a)(1)(B). (Doc. Nos. 6, 8.) This rule requires a party to file such a notice when "a state statute is questioned and the parties do not include the state, one of its agencies, or one of its officers or employees in an official capacity." Accordingly, the Court enters this order to certify the challenge according to Rule 5.1(b), which states that

1 “[t]he court must, under 28 U.S.C. § 2403, certify to the appropriate attorney general
2 that a statute has been questioned.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.1(b). The relevant portion of that
3 statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2403(b), states:

4 In any action, suit, or proceeding in a court of the United States to which
5 a State or any agency, officer, or employee thereof is not a party, wherein
6 the constitutionality of any statute of that State affecting the public interest
7 is drawn in question, the court shall certify such fact to the attorney
8 general of the State, and shall permit the State to intervene for presentation
9 of evidence, if evidence is otherwise admissible in the case, and for
argument on the question of constitutionality. The State shall, subject to
the applicable provisions of law, have all the rights of a party and be
subject to all liabilities of a party as to court costs to the extent necessary
for a proper presentation of the facts and law relating to the question of
constitutionality.

10 Accordingly, the Court certifies the constitutional challenge to the Attorney
11 General of California. Defendant New Albertson’s Inc. asserts that the First
12 Amendment to the United States Constitution bars the application of two California
13 statutes to conduct at issue in this case. The statutes are the California Confidentiality
14 of Medical Information Act, Cal. Civil Code § 56, *et seq.*, and the California Unfair
15 Competition Law, Cal. Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* As characterized
16 by New Albertson’s, Inc.’s notice, the conduct at issue is its alleged sale of
17 “anonymized” pharmacy records to third parties, where “anonymized” means that all
18 such records have been stripped of all “medical information,” as defined in Cal. Civil
19 Code § 56.05(g), prior to their transmission to any third party. (See Notice of
20 Constitutional Challenge to State Statutes, Doc. No. 8.)

21 Under Rule 5.1(c), “[u]nless the court sets a later time, the attorney general may
22 intervene within 60 days after the notice is filed or after the court certifies the challenge,
23 whichever is earlier.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.1(c). “Before the time to intervene expires, the
24 court may reject the constitutional challenge, but may not enter a final judgment holding
25 the statute unconstitutional.” *Id.* New Albertson’s Inc.’s motion to dismiss is currently
26 set for a hearing on August 11, 2008 at 10:30 a.m. At this time, the Court does not
27 continue the hearing, alter the parties’ briefing schedule, or extend the Attorney
28 General’s time to intervene. If Court becomes inclined to accept the constitutional

1 challenge, however, the Court will postpone entry of any final judgment until the
2 Attorney General has had an adequate opportunity to intervene. At this time, the Court
3 expresses no opinion on the merits of the constitutional challenge.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: July 11, 2008

6 
7 MARILYN L. HUFF, District Judge
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 COPIES TO:
9 All parties of record.

10 and

11 Office of the Attorney General
12 1300 "I" Street
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

13 and

14 Office of the Attorney General
15 110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100
P.O. Box 85366-5299
16 San Diego, CA 92186-5266